

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 15, 2003

LB 759

do appreciate things that have age. I would like to think that in some cases wisdom comes with that age. I would also like to believe that in the case of inanimate things that there is also still value. Whether it's an old building, whether it's an old vehicle, it still has value and we should not simply discard it out of hand and put it in a scrap heap somewhere, bulldoze it over in the case of a building, and not appreciate the labor and the time that went into creating and putting it into operation. So I think we need to place more emphasis on the value of things that are older and not just disregard them, destroy them, and then go out and buy something new to replace them. Old things do have value and I believe that we need to put more emphasis on that, and that repairing those things, keeping them in service, is a good and wise use of our resources. And I continue to be concerned about whether or not we use or abuse our resources, particularly those that aren't renewable. So for those two reasons, I would encourage support for my amendment. Those are my reasons in supporting the amendment. I would also state that this is part of a two-track system that we have adopted this session and that this same amendment has already been adopted on Senator Landis' bill that deals with repair labor. And that amendment was adopted and has advanced already. So this is the second opportunity to vote on that amendment. I think it's still worthy of advancing. It's still worthy of a yes vote. And this amendment was talked about the last time that we had discussion on LB 759, and I, at that time, stated that I could compromise and that we could make some changes so that it wasn't all motor vehicles, but that we could limit it to passenger vehicles...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR PREISTER: ...and those that were licensed as farm vehicles. That may be more complicated as we looked at it than I first anticipated because it may be difficult for the repair shops, the dealers, to differentiate those vehicles one from another to be able to do that. So we may later have an amendment to reduce this to just passenger and farm vehicles, and I'll have the opportunity to discuss that and whether the body really wants to do it. It may be better to go all or nothing. My preference is we go all. We adopt this amendment